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ABOUT PROJECT EVALUATION

LADOT is committed to understanding and reporting on how projects impact neighborhoods, and evaluating their overall effectiveness in achieving project goals. By using established metrics that illuminate how new public spaces and street design impact the life of the street, we can track trends over time, evaluate project performance, and inform future program direction.

Methodical observations and data gathering at a site—both before and after installation—help to understand the potential impacts of an LADOT project. Pedestrian and bicycle rider counts, vehicle volumes, and speed data collected before and after installation allow us to describe changes in safety, mobility, and accessibility. Other tools—such as interviews of pedestrians, occupants of expanded pedestrian spaces, and local business operators—capture perceptions of the neighborhood and the project itself. Other data available through local, state, and federal sources—such as collision reports or sales tax receipts—are also analyzed before and after projects are installed, giving us more information to understand what may change.
INTRODUCTION

GREAT STREETS FOR LOS ANGELES

Measuring Project Impact: A Citywide Priority

The Strategic Plan for the City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT), Great Streets for Los Angeles, and the Mayor’s Great Streets Initiative focus on transforming our streets, our largest public asset, to support desired outcomes including increased public safety, enhanced local culture, economic vitality and great neighborhoods.

A Safe City

A Livable and Sustainable City

A Prosperous City

A Well Run City

LADOT supports these goals by cost effectively repurposing underutilized public space into gathering places for Angelenos to come together, whether they walk, bike, drive, or take transit.

The Bradley Avenue Plaza and other People St projects change streets with temporary treatments, including plazas and parklets, that lay the groundwork for permanent changes in street design. Such projects are integral to the City’s Great Streets toolbox, and facilitate implementation and evaluation of LADOT’s Strategic Plan, Great Streets for Los Angeles, and the City’s Mobility Plan 2035.
The Bradley Avenue Plaza evaluation project (both this report and the post-installation report) is an opportunity to document performance metrics that assess how innovative street design supports these Great Streets goals:

**Safety**
- Reported Collisions by Party Involved
- Vehicular Speed
- Wrong Way Bicycle Riding

**Livability**
- Walking and Bicycling Activity
- Gender Balance
- Mode of Arrival
- Nuisance Activity on the Sidewalk
- User Perception

**Prosperity**
- Sales Tax Revenues
- Duration of Visit
- Frequency of Visit

**Governmental Efficiency**
- The evaluation itself is contributing to reaching this goal

This report highlights significant and interesting findings from the above categories. Complete project data are available at data.lacity.org or upon request via peoplest@lacity.org.
ABOUT THIS EXISTING CONDITIONS REPORT

This report offers an in-depth look at livability, safety, and prosperity prior to the installation of the Bradley Avenue Plaza. Primary and secondary data were collected starting in September 2014. A corresponding post-installation study (under separate cover) will be conducted in 2015 to compare the existing conditions reported in this document with those observed after the project has been in place for a year. The purpose of the evaluation is not to find a direct causal effect from the project, but rather to demonstrate how the project may contribute to changes across a variety of indicators, recognizing that additional factors contribute.

THE STUDY AREA

The catchment area for this project, shown on the next page, is Van Nuys Boulevard, between Pala and Lehigh Avenues, and a short section of Bradley Avenue. Observations were generally limited to those actions that occurred on the public right-of-way, including the street and sidewalk. The catchment area also includes transit access and the commercial establishments facing the street.

METHODOLOGY

Using primary data collection methods, the project evaluation team observed the ways in which people walked, rode bicycles, and drove, in order to understand the level and quality of activity in the public realm.

Secondary, contextual data were also collected to measure traffic speeds and volumes, collisions, transit use, and economic transactions.

AT A GLANCE

City Council District
District 7, Councilmember
Felipe Fuentes

Neighborhood Council District
Pacoima

Business Improvement District
None

Community Plan Area
Arleta-Pacoima

Mobility Plan 2035
Van Nuys Boulevard designations:
• Boulevard II
• Comprehensive Transit Enhanced Network
• Protected Bicycle Lane Segment
• Pedestrian Segment
INTRODUCTION
**Primary Data Collection Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Pedestrian &amp; bicyclist volume</th>
<th>Vehicle traffic volume</th>
<th>Vehicle speed survey</th>
<th>Activity scan of blockface</th>
<th>Pedestrian intercept survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 10 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 11 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 AM - 12 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 1 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 2 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 6 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 8 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 9 PM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PM - 7 AM</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Business operator questionnaires were also conducted as business operators were available.
Questionnaire Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of pedestrian intercept surveys conducted</th>
<th>Number of business operator surveys conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/14</td>
<td>11/13/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conducted in person Conducted in-person

Data Collection Locations
INTRODUCTION

Summary of Key Report Findings

Patron primary travel mode to area
- Estimated by merchants:
  - Car: 60%
  - Pedestrian: 40%
  - Bike: 0%
  - Bus: 0%
- Stated by pedestrian survey respondents:
  - Car: 15%
  - Pedestrian: 47%
  - Bike: 9%
  - Bus: 29%

Educational attainment
- Less than high school: 57%
- HS diploma or equivalent: 24%
- Some college: 12%
- Associate degree: 4%
- Bachelor’s degree: 2%
- Master’s degree, professional degree, or PhD: 2%

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode:
- Car:
  - Patron primary travel mode: 21
  - Estimation by merchants: 60%
  - Stated by pedestrian survey respondents: 15%
- Pedestrian:
  - Patron primary travel mode: 10
  - Estimation by merchants: 40%
  - Stated by pedestrian survey respondents: 47%
- Bike:
  - Patron primary travel mode: 6
  - Estimation by merchants: 0%
  - Stated by pedestrian survey respondents: 9%
- Bus:
  - Patron primary travel mode: 3
  - Estimation by merchants: 0%
  - Stated by pedestrian survey respondents: 29%

Collisions, by mode (2007-2011) within a 1/2-mile radius around the project site and the project catchment area:
- Car:
  - Project site: 111
  - Project catchment area: 24
- Pedestrian:
  - Project site: 2
  - Project catchment area: 4
- Bike:
  - Project site: 13
  - Project catchment area: 2
- Bus:
  - Project site: 15
  - Project catchment area: 29
**INTRODUCTION**

**Summary of Key Report Findings**

**PROJECT SITE**

Pedestrian survey respondents who visit the site daily, by mode:

- Presence of women
- Biking - Weekend: 38%
- Biking - Weekday: 32%
- Walking - Weekend: 40%
- Walking - Weekday: 33%

Educational attainment:

- Bachelor’s degree, Master’s degree, professional degree, or PhD: 2%
- HS diploma or equivalent: 24%
- Less than high school: 57%
- Some college: 12%
- Associate degree: 2%

**Collisions, by mode (2007-2011)**

- 1/2-mile radius around project site:
  - 111 (Car)
  - 24 (Pedestrian)
  - 17 (Bike)

- Project catchment area:
  - 13 (Car)
  - 4 (Pedestrian)
  - 2 (Bike)

**Presence of women**

- Census: 51%
- Pedestrian survey: 60%
- Walking - Weekend: 40%
- Walking - Weekday: 33%
- Biking - Weekend: 32%
- Biking - Weekday: 38%
Safety

Safety data are assembled from a variety of sources. Collision data are drawn from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) between 2007 and 2011, a service of the California Highway Patrol which reflects all reported collisions in California. Traffic counts were also collected, providing data on the volume and speed of vehicles traveling the Van Nuys Boulevard corridor. In addition, data on public perception of safety were collected using on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of pedestrians that reported the neighborhood was safe (see page 20 for more information on pedestrian perceptions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Number of fatal or severe injury collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Number of pedestrian collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Number of bicycle collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>Number of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY FINDINGS**

Within a half-mile radius of the project site, pedestrians were overrepresented in fatal or severe collisions.

A slightly higher percentage of speeding vehicles were observed in the southbound direction than the northbound direction.
**Collision Summary (2007 - 2011)**

**Project catchment area**

![Graph showing collision summary over years from 2007 to 2011.](image)

**Half-mile radius around study area**

![Graph showing collision summary over years from 2007 to 2011.](image)

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Between 2007 and 2011, there were four pedestrian collisions, two bicycle collisions, and 13 vehicular collisions reported in the project catchment area, for a total of 19 collisions.

In the half-mile radius around the project site, for the same time span, there were 17 bicycle collisions, 24 pedestrian collisions, and 111 vehicle collisions, for a total of 152 collisions reported, or an average of about 30 collisions per year.

Between 2007 and 2011, an increase in the total number of reported collisions was observed in the project catchment area.
Collision Locations (2007 - 2011)

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Between 2007 and 2011, the highest concentration of vehicular collisions in the project catchment area was at the intersection of Van Nuys Boulevard and Pala Avenue, where 8 collisions occurred. The highest concentration of pedestrian collisions was also at Van Nuys Boulevard and Pala Avenue. 3 pedestrian collisions occurred between 2007 and 2011. The 2 reported bicycle collisions in the project catchment area between 2007 and 2011 occurred at Van Nuys Boulevard's intersections with Pala and Lehigh Avenues.
### Collisions by Mode and Severity
**HALF-MILE RADIUS AROUND PROJECT SITE (2007-2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Killed or severely injured (KSI) collisions</th>
<th>Percent of all KSI collisions</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Total collisions</th>
<th>Percent of all collisions</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Pedestrian collisions resulting in a fatality or severe injury (KSI) are overrepresented as a subset of all KSI collisions, when compared to the overall rates of pedestrian and bicycle collisions as a subset of all collisions. Within a half mile from the project site, pedestrian collisions made up 16% and bicycle collisions made up 11% of all collisions, but pedestrian KSI collisions made up 33% of all KSI collisions. There were no fatal or severe injury (KSI) collisions in the project catchment area from 2007-2011.
Speeding Vehicles by Day and Direction
VAN NUYS BOULEVARD BETWEEN PALA AVENUE AND BRADLEY AVENUE

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Overall, a greater percentage of vehicles were “speeding” (driving over the posted speed limit) in the southbound direction than in the northbound direction.

On both the weekend day and the weekday, approximately 93% of vehicles were found to be compliant with the speed limit. On the weekday, volumes were slightly lower in the southbound direction, suggesting that lower volumes could correspond to higher speeds as a result of excess capacity. (See page 23 for more information about vehicle volumes.)

However, on the weekend day, volumes were nearly equal in both directions, and the same directional speeding pattern was observed. This indicates that vehicle volumes and speeds are not always inversely correlated.
Livability

Data on livability in the area around the Bradley Avenue Plaza were collected from on-the-street pedestrian questionnaires and business operator questionnaires. They offer a view into perceptions of the area, local quality of life, transportation patterns, behavior patterns, and the role the neighborhood plays in the lives of visitors and residents.

### Key Statistics

- **47%**  
  Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood on foot.
- **27%**  
  Percent of survey respondents who reported arriving in the neighborhood by bus.
- **89%**  
  Percent of survey respondents who visit the neighborhood daily or several times a week.
- **32%**  
  Percent of survey respondents who think the neighborhood is clean.

### Key Findings

- **During the weekday count period, 94 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and cyclists.**
- **During the weekend count period, 63 times as many vehicles were counted as pedestrians and bicyclists.**
- **About one third of the people observed bicycling or walking were female. According to the US Census, the area within a half-mile radius of the project site is 51% female.**
Primary Mode of Transportation to Neighborhood

Note: Width of line indicates percentage.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
More pedestrians (47%) responded that they arrived to the area primarily on foot than by any other mode. Twenty-seven percent reported primarily arriving by transit, 15% reported arriving by car, and 9% reported arriving by bicycle. Sixty percent of the business operators surveyed thought their patrons arrived primarily by car, which reveals that business operators may incorrectly assume their customers primarily drive, when they actually do not.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Frequent visits to an area suggest that it serves as a neighborhood destination.

With 89% of survey respondents visiting the area at least several times a week, this location appears to serve as a local destination.

The highest percentage of survey respondents (57%) said they were in the area because they live there, and the next highest percentage of survey respondents (26%) said they were in the area to eat, drink, shop, or meet friends.

These reasons indicate that while the area does appear to have local significance, frequency of visits appears to most closely be correlated with living in the area or recreating in the area. Page 20 illustrates the full set of survey responses to the reason for visiting the area, and other pedestrian perceptions.
Perceptions of Neighborhood & Reason for Visit

- Neighborhood is clean: 32%
- Neighborhood is safe: 43%
- Neighborhood is unattractive: 28%

- Passing through: 4%
- Work here: 4%
- Multiple reasons: 9%
- Eat/drink, meet friends, music/art, or shopping: 26%
- Live here: 57%

Note: Size of outline corresponds to percentage. Top percentages are each out of 100; bottom percentages all add to 100.
**Multimodal Volumes (WEEKDAY & WEEKEND)**

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

On the weekday, a total of 24,960 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 7 AM and 6 PM, 17,038 vehicles were counted, compared to 100 pedestrians and 81 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 1% of all travel in the catchment area.

On the weekend day, a total of 25,509 vehicles were counted over a 24-hour period.

Between 11 AM and 6 PM, 12,187 vehicles were counted, compared to 134 pedestrians and 59 bicycles over the same time period.

During this time period, bicyclists and pedestrians together accounted for about 2% of travel in the catchment area.
Pedestrian Characteristics (SCREENLINE)

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 134 pedestrians were counted.

Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 100 pedestrians were counted.

On the weekday, about 12 pedestrians per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 14 pedestrians per hour were counted.

Between 33%-40% of observed pedestrians were female, which is similar to the percent of bicyclists observed to be female.

Between 3% and 5% of pedestrians observed were using a wheelchair, and between 6% and 13% of pedestrians observed were using a skateboard.

On the weekend day, more young and old pedestrians (26% and 7%, respectively) were observed than on the weekday.
**Bicyclist Characteristics (SCREENLINE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wrong way</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No helmet</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**

Over the 11 hour weekday data collection period, a total of 59 bicyclists were counted.

Over the seven hour weekend data collection period, a total of 81 bicyclists were counted.

On the weekday, about 5 bicyclists per hour were counted. On the weekend, about 12 bicyclists per hour were counted.

Between 32%-38% of observed bicyclists were female, which is similar to the percent of pedestrians observed to be female.

On the weekend day, more young and old cyclists (34% and 5%, respectively) were observed than on the weekday.

About 15% of bicyclists observed were not wearing a helmet. Between 5-10% were riding on the sidewalk, and about 15% were riding in the wrong direction.
### Stationary Activities

#### Observed behaviors

- In a pair:
  - Mobile: 3
  - On-site: 0

- Standing:
  - Mobile: 2
  - On-site: 0

- Informally sitting:
  - Mobile: 1
  - On-site: 0

- Waiting to cross:
  - Mobile: 1
  - On-site: 0

- On mobile device:
  - Mobile: 0
  - On-site: 0

- Eating:
  - Mobile: 0
  - On-site: 0

- Panhandling:
  - Mobile: 0
  - On-site: 0

#### Observed characteristics

- Female:
  - Mobile: 6
  - On-site: 0

- Male:
  - Mobile: 4
  - On-site: 0

- Young:
  - Mobile: 2
  - On-site: 0

- Elder:
  - Mobile: 0
  - On-site: 0
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

High levels of people engaging in stationary activities can indicate that a public space feels comfortable, safe, and desirable to the people who use it.

Overall, very low levels of stationary behavior were observed in the Bradley Avenue Plaza project area, compared to overall levels of pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle activity.

Most persons observed tended to congregate in pairs or were seen standing individually. Only one person was observed sitting, which could suggest a lack of amenities in the area for stationary activities.

Sixty percent of people observed participating in a stationary activity were female, and 40% were male. In contrast, only about 30-40% of observed pedestrians and bicyclists were female.

Note: Weekday activity was measured between 7 AM and 5 PM. Activity scans were not conducted on the weekend.
## Physical Assets in Public Right-of-Way

**BRADLEY AVENUE SOUTH OF VAN NUYS BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike corral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike rack</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus shelter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public bench</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street light</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lighting not at pedestrian scale and no lighting on the plaza area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Trees are immature and provide little shade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting strip</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private seating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None adjacent to the plaza space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Related Key Assets

**BRADLEY AVENUE SOUTH OF VAN NUYS BOULEVARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shade</td>
<td>Very little shade in the plaza area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>The sidewalks are generally good quality with features (i.e., seating and tree wells) narrowing width in some areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prosperity

Data relating to the prosperity of the area are assembled from three sources: business questionnaires, pedestrian questionnaires, and sales tax receipts. The questionnaires provide insight into merchants’ and customers’ behaviors and perceptions. The tax data provide a quantitative complement to the insights gained through the questionnaires.

**KEY STATISTICS**

- **5-7 PM**
  Busiest time of day on weekdays as reported by business operators.

- **$10-30**
  Average amount of money spent per visit to the area by people who arrived on foot.

- **60+ MINS**
  Most common length of stay per visit for all travel modes.

- **49**
  Number of active businesses in the study area in 2014.

**KEY FINDINGS**

- Overall, people who reach the area on foot tend to visit most frequently.
- Over the last 10 years, the number of businesses in the area has risen slightly.
- Over the last 10 years, business tax revenues have fluctuated.
Busiest Times of Day

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

Based on the business operator questionnaire, 5 PM - 7 PM was the most common response to “When are your two busiest times of day?” for weekdays. Mornings (Open - 12 PM) and afternoons (2 PM - 5 PM) were the most common responses for weekends.

The busiest time of day for businesses may correspond to the busiest time of day overall. These responses reflect a typical residential and recreational pattern, with a lot of evening activity after people get home from work.

Opening and closing times are approximate. Number of weekday and weekend responses differs because some businesses are closed on weekends. Pedestrian activity is based on counts described on page 23.
Spending & Frequency of Visit by Mode

Average amount spent per visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$0-5</th>
<th>$5-10</th>
<th>$10-30</th>
<th>$30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of visits

- Less than once a month
- Once a month
- Several times a month
- Once a week
- Several times a week
- Daily
Duration of Stay by Mode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? (PREVIOUS PAGE)
For all modes, people most commonly responded that they visited the area daily. Most pedestrians reported spending $10-$30 on each visit. For all other modes, responses were more evenly distributed across the categories in terms of amount spent per visit.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED? (ABOVE)
Fewer survey respondents used a bicycle or a car as their primary mode of access to the area. Therefore these small samples may not be representative of bicyclist or driver spending patterns.

The most common length of stay for all modes was one hour or more.
WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
The City of Los Angeles collects a business tax for most businesses in the city based on “tax measures”—typically retail/wholesale sales or payments for services received. Tax data were aggregated across all businesses in the study area to protect confidentiality, and reflect overall economic vitality in the area.

Business tax measures were higher in 2014 than in 2005, and reflect some fluctuation between 2008 and 2012.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
The number of businesses paying business tax is relatively representative of the total number of businesses in the area; the data do not include businesses that are not required to pay the tax or businesses that evade taxation.

In 2014 there were more businesses paying business tax than in 2005, but there has not been a clear increasing or decreasing trend in the number of businesses in the area over the past 10 years.
Context

Demographic information was assembled from the US Census American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates from 2008-2012 (ACS). In addition, demographic information was collected as part of the pedestrian surveys. This section presents findings from both sources, to demonstrate the differences between ACS data and primary data collected by the People St project team.

The differences between ACS data and pedestrian survey data are likely related to the fact that the pedestrian survey captured people who do not live in the area, and are therefore not reflected in the ACS, but who were in the area for work, shopping, or other purposes on the day the surveys were collected.

### KEY STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are female according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are male according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area with less than a high school diploma, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are under 35 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are over 65 years old, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are White, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who are Black, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>Percent of residents in the area who identify as Latino or Hispanic, according to the ACS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Split of Community

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**
According to the ACS, the community is split almost evenly between male and female residents. However, 60% of pedestrian survey respondents were female and only 40% were male.
Educational Attainment

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
More than half the people living in this area (57%) have less than a high school diploma. About 8% have a higher education degree.

2% EACH
Associate degree; Master’s degree, professional degree, or PhD
**Age Distribution of Community**

**Pedestrian Survey**
- Under 18: 12%
- 18 - 24: 9%
- 25 - 34: 14%
- 35 - 64: 60%
- 65 - 74: 5%
- 75+: 0%

**Census**
- Under 18: 32%
- 18 - 24: 13%
- 25 - 34: 16%
- 35 - 64: 30%
- 65 - 75: 6%
- 75+: 2%

**WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?**
According to the ACS, the majority of residents in this area (59%) are between 18 and 64. About 32% are under 18 years old, and about 8% are over 65.

Compared to the Census' ACS, the pedestrian survey over-represented people between 35-64 years old, and under-represented other age categories.
Racial and Ethnic Distribution of Community

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
According to the ACS, the predominant racial identity of residents in this area is White (84%), followed by 9% identifying as Black. A majority of residents (92%) also identify as Hispanic or Latino.

Compared to the ACS, the pedestrian survey over-represents Black respondents, under-represents White respondents, and shows a near parity in Latino responses.
For information on People St
visit peoplest.lacity.org
e-mail peoplest@lacity.org

fb.com/ladotpeoplest
www.flickr.com/groups/peoplest
@LADOTPpeopleSt
@LADOTPpeopleSt
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